

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

In the Official action, claims 44 and 45 were withdrawn from consideration. However, as those claims are dependent from elected claim 37, it is submitted that they should not have been withdrawn.

It is assumed that the secondary reference being relied upon in the Official action is Yarng et al. U.S. Patent 5,375,928. That reference is not listed on Form PTO-892. Also, the patent number and the inventor's name are stated incorrectly in the body of the Official action.

Claim 37 has been amended to delete reference to a shower stall, so the objection to the drawing is obviated.

Claim 37 has also been amended to recite that the removal of tissues occurs in the same direction as the expansion of the disposal section, a feature not disclosed by either of Rhinegold and Yarng et al. Thus, the forces imposed on the body do not tend to bend or break the expandable (and thus somewhat weaker) part of the body as would be the case if the forces were applied in a direction transverse to the direction of expansion.

Also, in the case of a body in which the expansion occurs in a vertical direction, and is suspended by an upper portion thereof as recited in claims 40 and 41, the body will not tend to be undesirably displaced horizontally about its suspension point when removing tissues.

The direction of tissue being the same as the expansion direction also facilitates the opening of the top and/or bottom portions of the body to expose the interior thereof for emptying the issue disposed section and/or inserting fresh tissues,

as recited in claims 47-52. Note that neither Rhinegold nor Yarn et al. discloses a body which can be opened.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 29, 2007

By: 

Alan E. Kopecki  
Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620